

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
JUN 26 2007

Remarks

Applicant respectfully requests that this Amendment After Final Action be admitted under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116.

Applicant submits that this Amendment presents claims in better form for consideration on appeal. Furthermore, applicant believes that consideration of this Amendment could lead to favorable action that would remove one or more issues for appeal.

Claims 30 and 38 have been amended. No claims have been canceled. Therefore, claims 30-51 are now presented for examination.

Claims 30, 43, and 46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Carr (U.S. Patent No. 5,293,379) in view of Togawa et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0004821). Applicant submits that the present claims are patentable over Carr.

Carr discloses a data processing system employing a compression method. See Carr at Abstract. The method includes reformatting each data packet by associating its static fields with a first packet region and its dynamic fields with a second packet region. The process then assembles a static table that includes static information from at least an initial data packet's first packet region. It then identifies static field information in a subsequent data packet's first packet region that is common to the information in the static table. Such common information is encoded so as to reduce its data length. The common static information is then replaced in the modified data packet with the encoded common static information and the modified data packet is then transmitted. A similar action occurs with respect to user-data information. A single dictionary table is created for all packet headers, while separate dictionary tables are created for each user-data

portion of a packet-type experienced in the communication network thereby enabling better compression. Id.

Togawa discloses a mail system equipped with a mail address manager for managing a mail address or addresses of one or more destinations. When a mail address of a particular destination is updated, the mail address manager registers the old mail address of the particular destination and a new mail address in correlation with each other. The result is that, even when the mail address of an intended destination has been updated, a mail source can proceed to send an e-mail, which is addressed to the intended destination at the old mail address, exactly to the intended destination without checking whether the mail address of the intended destination has been updated. Also at the mail source, it is possible to send an e-mail exactly to an intended destination without checking a restriction on a system environment of the intended destination. See Togawa at Abstract.

Claim 30 of the present application recites:

A method comprising:
receiving data at an interface from a service;
identifying at the interface whether the data is an
electronic mail (email) message corresponding to a user
mailbox or address book data corresponding to the user
address book;
applying a first set of code words to encode data in
the email message; and
applying a second set of code words to encode the
address book data.

Applicant submits that nowhere in Carr or Togawa is there disclosed or suggested a process of identifying whether data is an email message corresponding to a user mailbox or address book data corresponding to a user address book. Particularly, neither reference discloses or suggests identifying whether data is an email message or address

book data. The Examiner maintains that Carr discloses such a feature at col. 6, ll. 64 – col. 7, ll. 46. See Final Office Action at page 2, paragraph 4. The passage relied upon by the Examiner recites:

Thus, given the above packet data fields and their essential characteristics, the invention reorders them by segregating them as follows: static; recalculatable; semi-static; and dynamic. The reordered fields occupy the same memory space as the original packet header. The static, recalculatable, and semi-static fields are then compressed using a modified LZW protocol with a dictionary table that is created specifically for the header data. Compression continues into the dynamic fields until the first incompressible field is encountered, at which point the remainder of the dynamic fields are not encoded, but are sent through as unencoded eight bit data. Then, the type field of the LAN packet is used to select a "user-data" LZW dictionary, which dictionary is used to compress the user-data portion of the LAN packet. At the end of the packet, a bit is appended that indicates whether the user data field has been compressed. While it is preferred to use the LZW algorithm, the compression of reformatted packet fields can be done using other string compression algorithms.

Turning now to FIG. 5, a reformatted TCP/IP packet is shown wherein the various categories of header fields have been moved within the packet to segregate static, semi-static and dynamic fields; and user data fields. The recalculatable fields have been zeroed, and the sequence and acknowledgement number most significant words (MSW) segregated into the static region of the packet. The identification, sequence, and acknowledgement fields have been segregated into most and least significant portions, with the former being placed in the static region and the latter in the dynamic region.

Once the packet is reformatted, as shown in FIG. 5, it is ready to be compressed using an appropriate string compression algorithm. During compression, individual dictionary tables (see FIG. 6) will be employed. One is derived specifically for the header data, while the remaining are for user-data appearing in specific types

of protocol packets. For instance, if a TCP protocol is found, a separate TCP user-data dictionary will be created. Likewise, if ICMP, UDP, or LAT protocol packets are detected, they too will have individual user data dictionaries created and will be utilized for succeeding protocol packets of an identical packet type. The segregation of static data into one area of the packet enables substantially improved compression to occur. Furthermore, the use of individual user-data dictionaries for sequences of identical packet types improves the probability that user data appearing in succeeding packets will be efficiently compressed.

Applicant respectfully submits that nowhere in the above-passage is there disclosed, or reasonably suggested, a process of *identifying whether data is an email message or address book data*. Specifically, the passage fails to disclose or suggest a process of distinguishing as to whether data is email message or address book data. In fact, there is no discussion of the term "address" in the passage.

Because Carr and Togawa each fail to disclose or suggest identifying whether data is an email message corresponding to a user mailbox or address book data corresponding to a user address book, any combination of Carr and Togawa would also fail to disclose or suggest such a feature. Thus, claim 30 and its dependent claims are patentable over Carr in view of Togawa.

Independent claims 38, 43 and 48, and their respective dependent claims, are patentable over Carr in view of Togawa for the reasons described above with respect to claim 30 since each of claims 38, 43 and 48 also recite identifying whether the data is an email message corresponding to a user mailbox or address book data corresponding to the user address book.

Claims 36-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Carr and Togawa as applied to claim 30, and further in view of Unger

et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,991,713). Applicant submits that the present claims are patentable over Carr and Togawa even in view of Unger.

Unger discloses a method for compressing text including parsing words from text in an input file and comparing the parsed words to a predetermined dictionary. The dictionary has a plurality of vocabulary words in it and numbers or tokens corresponding to each vocabulary word. A further step is determining which of the parsed words are not present in the predetermined dictionary and creating at least one supplemental dictionary including the parsed words that are not present in the predetermined dictionary. The predetermined dictionary and the supplemental dictionary are stored together in a compressed file. Also, the parsed words are replaced with numbers or tokens corresponding to the numbers assigned in the predetermined and supplemental dictionary and the numbers or tokens are stored in the compressed file. See Unger at Abstract.

Nevertheless, Unger does not disclose or suggest identifying whether data is an email message corresponding to a user mailbox or address book data corresponding to the user address book. As discussed above, Carr and Togawa do not disclose or suggest identifying whether data is an email message corresponding to a user mailbox or address book data corresponding to the user address book. Therefore, any combination of Carr, Togawa and Unger would also not disclose or suggest such a feature. Accordingly, the present claims are patentable over Carr and Togawa in view of Unger.

Claim 30-32, 38-40, and 43-51 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaffer (U.S. Patent No. 6,842,768) in view of Carr and Togawa. Applicant submits that the present claims are patentable over Carr and Togawa even in view of Shaffer.

Shaffer discloses that messages or data files of various compressions can be intelligently and efficiently managed as needed based on a current connection speed. Nonetheless, Shaffer does not disclose or suggest identifying whether data is an email message corresponding to a user mailbox or address book data corresponding to the user address book. As discussed above, Carr and Togawa do not disclose or suggest such a feature. Therefore, any combination of Carr, Togawa and Unger would also not disclose or suggest the feature. Accordingly, the present claims are patentable over Carr and Togawa in view of Shaffer.

Claim 42 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Shaffer, Carr, and Togawa and further in view of Unger et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,991,713). Applicant submits that present claims are patentable over the combination of Carr, Togawa, Shaffer and Unger for the reasons stated above.

Claims 30, 33-35, 38, and 41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaffer in view of Lindquist et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,687,362) and the combination of Carr and Togawa. Applicant submits that present claims are patentable over the combination of Carr, Togawa, Shaffer and Lindquist.

Lindquist discloses an automatic address book update system that automates the data collection and maintenance tasks for computerized address book systems. The automatic address book update system is architected to automatically update the data contained therein, by automatically populating the address entries of a subscriber's computerized address book system.

However, Lindquist does not disclose or suggest identifying whether data is an email message corresponding to a user mailbox or address book data corresponding to the

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**JUN 26 2007**

user address book. As discussed above, Carr, Togawa and Shaffer do not disclose or suggest such a feature. Therefore, any combination of Carr, Togawa, Shaffer and Lindquist would also not disclose or suggest the feature. As a result, the present claims are patentable over the combination of Carr, Togawa, Shaffer and Lindquist.

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections have been overcome, and that the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests the rejections be withdrawn and the claims be allowed.

The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOLODFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: June 26, 2007

Mark L. Watson
Reg. No. 46,322

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, California 94085-4040
(303) 740-1980